



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/544,190	08/02/2005	Takahiro Ike	37547	8297
116	7590	08/07/2007	EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP			STRIEB, MICHAEL A	
1801 EAST 9TH STREET				
SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			2809	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/544,190	IKE ET AL.
	Examiner Michael A. Strieb	Art Unit 2809

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/02/2005; 05/08/2006.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Terminal Disclaimer***

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: "inputted means" should likely read "inputting means". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sergeant et al (5,627,616).

Regarding claim 1, Sergeant et al discloses a camera to be disposed in a remote place, said camera having an optical axis (column 4, lines 5-7); driving means for driving said camera to have said optical axis of said camera moved in each of horizontal

and vertical directions (column 2, lines 29-36); position detecting means for detecting a position of said optical axis of said camera in each of said horizontal and vertical directions (column 3, lines 4-8, 25-30); position information storing means for storing position information indicative of said position of said optical axis of said camera to have said position information linked to an image taken at said position by said camera (column 3, lines 4-8); and remote controlling apparatus to be electronically connected to said driving means through a communication network to control said driving means, said remote controlling apparatus including display means for displaying on a screen said image taken at said position by said camera to have said screen linked to said position information (column 6, lines 22-24, 29-34, 43-47; Figure 9).

Regarding **claim 3**, Sergeant et al discloses an imaging system as set forth in claim 1 further comprising a position registering means for registering said position detected by said position detecting means with an optical condition of the camera (column 9, lines 63-67; column 10, lines 53-57) in which said driving means is adapted to drive said camera on the basis of said registered position and optical condition (column 10, lines 1-39).

Regarding **claim 6**, Sergeant et al discloses an imaging system as set forth in claim 1 further comprising an image information storing means for storing image information indicative of said images taken by said camera at said positions to have said stored images linked to said respective positions (column 10, lines 53-67; column 11, lines 1-20).

Regarding **claim 9**, Sergeant et al discloses an imaging system as set forth in claim 1 in which said remote controlling apparatus is adapted to obtain viewing angle information on a viewing angle of a lens unit of said camera to calculate a distance in each of said horizontal and vertical directions on the basis of said viewing angle information (column 11, lines 33-59).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 2, 4-5, and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sergeant et al (5,627,616) in view of Washino et al (5,625,410).

Regarding **claim 2**, Sergeant et al discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

Sergeant et al does not disclose that said screen has a divided image screen. Further, Sergeant et al does not disclose that said display means is adapted to display images sequentially taken at said respective positions by said camera on said divided image section in conjunction with said detected positions.

Washino et al discloses that said screen has a divided image screen (Figures 1-6; column 5, lines 16-17). Further, Washino et al discloses that said display means is adapted to display images sequentially taken at said respective positions by said camera on said divided image section in conjunction with said detected positions (column 5, lines 30-33).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the display as disclosed in Washino et al with the imaging system as disclosed in Sergeant et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the operator to view a wider range of images at one time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Washino et al with Sergeant et al to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 2.

Regarding **claim 4**, Sergeant et al discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

Sergeant et al does not disclose that said screen has an enlarged image section. Further, Sergeant et al does not disclose an image switching means for allowing said display means to display a moving image taken at said selected position by said camera to have said moving image displayed on said enlarged image section, said image

Art Unit: 2809

switching means, when one of said images displayed on said divided image section is selected, being adapted to allow said camera to be moved and occupy a position linked to said selected image.

Washino et al discloses that said screen has an enlarged image section (Figures 3, 5-6).

Further, Washino et al discloses an image switching means for allowing said display means to display a moving image taken at said selected position by said camera to have said moving image displayed on said enlarged image section, said image switching means, when one of said images displayed on said divided image section is selected, being adapted to allow said camera to be moved and occupy a position linked to said selected image (column 5, lines 31-33).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the screen and switching means as disclosed by Washino et al with the imaging system as disclosed by Sergeant et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the operator to examine in greater detail an image of his/her choice.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Washino et al with Sergeant et al to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 4.

Regarding **claim 5**, Sergeant et al discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

Sergeant et al does not disclose that the remote controlling apparatus is adapted to control said driving means at regular time intervals to have said camera sequentially

take images at said positions linked to said images displayed on said divided image section to allow said images displayed on said divided image section to be updated to said images taken by said camera.

Washino et al discloses that the remote controlling apparatus is adapted to control said driving means at regular time intervals to have said camera sequentially take images at said positions linked to said images displayed on said divided image section to allow said images displayed on said divided image section to be updated to said images taken by said camera (column 5, line 20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote controlling apparatus as disclosed by Washino et al with the imaging system as disclosed by Sergeant et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to keep the operator apprised of any changes in the area imaged from one time period to the next.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Washino et al with Sergeant et al to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 5.

Regarding **claim 7**, Sergeant et al discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

Sergeant et al does not disclose that the remote controlling apparatus is adapted to control said driving means to have said camera take images at predetermined time intervals at said positions, which further comprises a difference detecting means for detecting differences to said images in each position, and in which said remote

controlling apparatus is adapted to produce a notification signal on said differences detected by said difference detecting means.

Washino et al discloses that the remote controlling apparatus is adapted to control said driving means to have said camera take images at predetermined time intervals at said positions, which further comprises a difference detecting means for detecting differences to said images in each position, and in which said remote controlling apparatus is adapted to produce a notification signal on said differences detected by said difference detecting means (column 3, lines 21-26; column 8, lines 10-16).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote controlling apparatus disclosed by Washino et al with the imaging system disclosed by Sergeant et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the operator to be automatically notified of any change in the image of a particular area of interest, freeing the operator from having to make a constant surveillance of the images.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Washino et al with Sergeant et al to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 7.

Regarding **claim 8**, Sergeant discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

Sergeant et al does not disclose that said displaying means of said remote controlling apparatus is adapted to enlarge said image linked to a position in which said

difference of said images is detected by said difference detecting means, and to display said enlarged image on said enlarged image section..

Washino et al discloses that said displaying means of said remote controlling apparatus is adapted to enlarge said image linked to a position in which said difference of said images is detected by said difference detecting means, and to display said enlarged image on said enlarged image section (column 3, lines 21-26).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the displaying means as disclosed by Washino et al with the imaging system as disclosed by Sergeant et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the operator to see an area of interest in more detail, such area of interest comprising one in which a difference has been detected.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Washino et al with Sergeant et al to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 8.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sergeant et al (5,627,616) in view of Katz (5,216,502).

Regarding **claim 10**, Sergeant et al discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

Sergeant et al does not disclose that said remote controlling apparatus further includes inputting means for inputting descriptive information on said images at said respective positions, and said display means is adapted to superimpose said descriptive

information inputted by said inputted means on said respective images to be displayed on said divided image section or said enlarged image section.

Katz discloses that said remote controlling apparatus further includes inputting means for inputting descriptive information on said images at said respective positions, and said display means is adapted to superimpose said descriptive information inputted by said inputted means on said respective images to be displayed on said divided image section or said enlarged image section (column 3, lines 32-38).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote controlling apparatus as disclosed by Katz with the imaging system as disclosed by Sergeant et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the current and future operators with additional information about the image being viewed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Katz with Sergeant et al to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 10.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Swanson et al (5,689,442) "Event surveillance system"

Joao (US 6,587,046 B2) "Monitoring apparatus and method"

Rhodes et al (US 5,923,364) "Video security system"

Monroe (US 2003/0025599 A1) "Method and apparatus for collecting, sending, archiving, and retrieving motion video and still images and notification of detected events"

Coutta (US 4,337,482 A) "Surveillance system"

Clever (US 4,145,715 A) "Surveillance system"

10. Any response to this office action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand - delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Strieb whose telephone number is 571-270-3528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benny Tieu can be reached on (571) 272-7490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2809

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MAS

  
BENNY TIEU  
SPE/TRAINER